

REMARKS

The specification stand objected to due to a grammatical error. Specifically, the Examiner objects to the phrase “emissions of polarization.” Applicant has amended the specification to correct this phrase as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the phrase “to apply data for each of the color channels to corresponding ones of the plural polarizations” from claim 1 is indefinite because the plural polarizations are characteristics of the emissions, and thus not subjects to which data can be applied. In response, Applicant has amended the phrase in claim 1 to recite “to apply data for each of the color channels to the emissions having corresponding ones of the plural polarizations.”

The Examiner also asserts that the phrase “said plurality of receptors activating a corresponding color channel of said pixels,” as recited in claim 1 is indefinite. In response, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that the receptors activate the pixel using a corresponding color channel. In light of these amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-24 is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that an objection would have been appropriate as the phrases would have been understood by an ordinary artisan. Applicant acknowledges that the phrasing was informal and awkward, and a correction has been made. It is believed that the scope of the claim remains the same, and that an artisan would have understood the claim as written. These amendments are made to expedite prosecution.

Claims 1-24 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the pixel is activated by the receptors only when emissions having a polarization state which corresponds to the color channel are received. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1-24. Again, it is believed that an objection would have been appropriate as it is clear that the claim would have been read by an ordinary artisan to mean that the pixel is activated by the receptors only when emissions having a polarization state which corresponds to the color channel are received. It is believed that the scope of claim 1 is unchanged, and that an artisan would have understood the claim as written. The amendment is made to expedite prosecution.

Claim 37 stand rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sahouani et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0184862). Applicant traverses this rejection because Sahouani does not disclose a receptor means that is responsive to each of the plurality of polarizations, as recited in amended claim 37.

Sahouani shows, in Fig. 6, a liquid crystal display panel 600 including a top polarizer 602, a liquid crystal layer 608, a bottom alignment layer 610, a color filter layer 612, a bottom polarizer 616, and a backlight 618. The color filter layer 612 is made from colored polarizers that transmit only one color of light having one polarization state, and absorb substantially all other visible light. The light that passes through the color filter layer 612 is received by the bottom alignment layer 610, and then is either allowed to pass through the liquid crystal layer 608, or is substantially


blocked by the liquid crystal layer, which the Examiner asserts corresponds to encoding data onto each of the separate color data channels. The Examiner also asserts that the liquid crystal layer 608, together with transistors or switching elements actively produce a color display for each of the polarizations of received light.

However, Sahouani is silent regarding any means for receiving emissions that responds to each of the plurality of polarizations, as now recited in claim 37. That is, the bottom alignment layer of Sahouani, which the Examiner asserts corresponds to a receiving means, produces no response to the received light. Additionally, Sahouani fails to disclose that the liquid crystal display is optically addressable. For these reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 37.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Kevin T. Bastuba
Registration No. 59,905

April 28, 2008
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978